

involution In some of our specimens of  
Brodiaea the spikes have most of them  
lost their involucre.

I keep up Zippelia as a distinct genus,  
I also follow Lae Dr in keeping up Vestralia  
but too not place in that genus the  
African Peperomia Knobbeveana which  
Lae Dr. has judged of from the plate and  
not from the description. It must be  
a true Peperomia very closely allied to  
if not a variety of the common P. pellucida.

Saururus form a distinct tribe of  
Peperonia species the plant named Sectoris  
Kil. is an anomalous genus - but I cannot  
follow Baillon in putting Chloranthus  
Natanus and Ceratophyllum into Peperonia  
He might as well have lumped together all  
Dicotyledons without any perianth.

Your very sincerely  
George Dontham

25. WILTON PLACE.  
London S.W.

March 21/89

My dear Gray

When I last wrote I was just  
attaching Moradendron which Eicklen has  
very well worked out and I have adopted  
his Dendrothoron for a number of species  
chiefly but not entirely West Indian (as  
there are two or three from central America  
and Columbia) which have the peculiar  
inflorescence of Moradendron but somewhat  
simplified and the anthers of Acrethobium.  
Moradendron juniperinum Engelm.  
must go into Acrethobium notwithstanding  
its numerous female perianths. The number  
of parts of the perianth throughout Acrethobium  
is of little consequence and there is no  
mistaking the inflorescence of Acrethobium  
although the absence of male flowers prevent the  
ascertaining its essential character.

In general Eicklé's working up of  
Saururus is very good I cannot say  
as much of Casimir De Candolle's *Piperum*  
which I have just gone through. There is  
much carelessness - for instance two Mexican  
new *Peperomias* figured in Hooker's *Icones*  
t. 325 and 332 were only marked in his  
herbarium n. sp. and Cas. Dc. did not take  
the very little trouble to identify them  
but published both under different names  
from the very specimens figured. *P. Galatium*  
Hook is *P. mexicana* Ellig. and *P. lanceolata* Hook  
is *P. Erasmia* Cas. Dc. *Piper Annoniacum* Cas.  
Dc. n. 600 is *P. stylorum* Ellig. n. 670 and *P.*  
*Annoniacum*  $\beta$  is the widely different *P. muric-*  
*catum* Ellig. Pl. n. 614 - and I have come across  
many other such ~~cases~~ instances of carelessness.  
He attended chiefly to the anatomical structure  
of the stems and venation of the leaves.

As far as your *Hoya* is concerned I

Also a *Peperomia* in Florida

admit two genera *Saururus* and *Houttuynia*.  
*Saururoxys Cumingii* is identical with  
*Saururus Courcierii* and *Saururoxys Chinensis*  
is only a very slight variety from *Amoy* with  
rather narrower leaves - The so-called  
opposite hypogynal scales are abortive or  
injured stamens which happened to be on the  
flowers examined by Heryonians but  
only very rare in Fortune's specimens.

I cannot keep up *Anemioxis* as a  
genus distinct from *Houttuynia* though  
a very distinct species. Pray tell me what  
is *Anemioxis Botanderi* Cas. Dc. *Philipsiana*  
XXXVII 337 We have no specimen from  
Botander and in carefully going through  
Cas. Dc.'s long diagnosis I can find nothing  
that does not apply to the common  
Californian species.

*Gymnotheca* Dcne must be a  
*Houttuynia* - perhaps the common one or  
at any rate a nearly allied species either  
without any or accidentally deprived of it.